DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 088 196 EA 005 930

AUTHOR	Spivak, Harriet; And Others
TITLE	The School Attitudes Study. An Interim Report.
INSTITUTION	Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Oct 70
NOTE	76p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$4.20
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Attitudes; *Educational Research; Elementary Schools; *Parent Attitudes; Program Effectiveness; *School Community Relationship; *School Environment; Secondary Schools; Socioeconomic Status; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*New York City

ABSTRACT

At a time when the structure and functioning of several American institutions have come under attack, some significant questions need to be investigated. In particular, there is the need to understand how institutions and their clients relate to one another; how different patterns of formal and informal interaction affect the legitimacy accorded to these institutions by clients; and what the relationships between patterns of interaction and client-perceived legitimacy imply for the stability of these institutions. The School Attitudes Study is an effort to analyze these underlying forces and relationships in New York City's schools. The primary concern is determining the extent to which feelings of legitimacy are related to perceptions of effectiveness, responsiveness, and trust. Additionally, the study probes into whether the processes that generate legitimacy vary in different school-community contexts (e.g., whether trust is the most salient determinant in some contexts, effectiveness in others, responsiveness in others, and particular combinations of these factors in still others.) The report first states the problem under investigation, then explains in some detail the procedures used, and finally reports preliminary impressions of trends and patterns in the data. (Author)

ED 088196 S 33

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE SCHOOL ATTITUDES STUDY

An Interim Report

Harriet Spivak, Rita Senf, and Morton Inger

with the assistance of

Victor D'Lugin, Katharine Dunne,
James Marrin, and Gregory Zayas

October 1970

EA 005 930

Center for Urban Education
105 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

SECTION I: STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM. 4

SECTION II: PROCEDURES. 11

SECTION III: FINDINGS. 34

REFERENCES. 68

APPENDIX: PARENT INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

INTRODUCTION

The New York City school system during the last four years has been in a seemingly constant state of turmoil over demands for increased parent and community involvement in educational decision-making. Since the emergence of the decentralization-community control issue, the New York City school controversies have produced what appears to be a crisis of confidence in the public schools in some parts of the city. Reports from the press and other media suggest that increasing numbers of New York City residents are losing confidence in the ability of the city school system to improve academic achievement levels, or to provide the kind or quality of education they want for their children.

Many of the issues raised by the decentralization-community control controversies resemble questions raised in recent years in attacks on institutional authority in a wide range of other contexts, such as student unrest; or the efforts of many ghetto residents to gain control over institutions that affect their lives; or middle-class protests against unresponsive bureaucracies that control vital social services. All these situations indicate crises of confidence in major institutions. Underlying all are feelings that institutions are not functioning effectively, that those who have decision-making authority cannot be trusted to do what is right, and that the decision-makers are not responsive to the needs of those they serve nor open to their influence. All involve orientations toward expanding the participatory base in decision-making. All suggest that restoring legitimacy to institutions currently under attack will require opening up these institutions to a greater amount of client influence.

At a time when the structure and functioning of several American institutions have come under attack, some significant questions need to be investigated. In particular, we need to understand how institutions and their clients relate to one another; how different patterns of formal and informal interaction affect the legitimacy clients accord these institutions; and what the relationships between patterns of interaction and client-perceived legitimacy imply for the stability of these institutions.

The School Attitudes Study is an effort to analyze these underlying forces and relationships in a context in which they have become particularly salient. We wish to determine what factors explain attitudes of confidence or lack of confidence in the city's schools. Our primary concern is determining the extent to which feelings of legitimacy are related to perceptions of effectiveness, responsiveness, and trust. Further, we would like to know whether the processes that generate legitimacy vary in different school-community contexts (e.g., whether trust is the most salient determinant in some contexts, effectiveness in others, responsiveness in others, and particular combinations of these factors in still others).

The research was planned with long-range development objectives in mind. Our findings should eventually help to guide many important decisions concerning program development. If effective school-community programs are to be developed, we need to know more about the causal chains generating legitimacy or disaffection, and the points in those chains where intervention will be most productive. Further, we need

to know what kinds of programs in school-community relations should have the greatest promise of success in differing school-community contexts. In some contexts, the kind of program most needed might focus on institutional structure and functioning, particularly the way school staff try to relate to students, parents, and community residents. In other contexts, the source of school-community problems might not be in the schools themselves but rather in the way parents and community residents perceive them. Such communities would need programs that focus on developing better techniques for informing the community about its schools. However, strategies focused on improving school-community relations might be inappropriate in still other school-community contexts where legitimacy is associated primarily with school effectiveness. In these settings, programs focused directly on raising student achievement levels would have greater promise of restoring confidence in the schools.

The pages that follow are divided into three sections: Section I states the problem under investigation; Section II explains in some detail the procedures used; and Section III reports preliminary impressions of trends and patterns in our data. Additional reports will present findings of later stages of data analysis.

SECTION I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

When the legitimacy of a system is seriously undermined, its personnel become so absorbed in efforts to alleviate tension that vital resources are drained from the system's essential functions. Unless some thing is done to restore legitimacy to the system, it is eventually immobilized. In the New York City school system, especially between 1966 and 1969, school principals and the headquarters staff of district offices and the central Board of Education have repeatedly complained that educational problems have been forced to take a back seat to more pressing political problems, i.e., dealing with those who no longer support the system. The 1969 school decentralization law represents the officially sanctioned effort of the city's Board of Education and the state legislature to restore legitimacy to the system through locally-elected community school boards. Whether or not the decentralized structure will achieve this objective may depend on the extent to which educators in positions of authority are aware of, and can effectively deal with, the sources of disaffection.

What became apparent in the school conflicts in New York City during the past few years is that adversaries in the struggle were operating from vastly different frames of reference. At the core of notions of community control was a new view of the decision-making process that was in sharp conflict with the prevailing view held by those in positions of authority. This new view of decision-making entailed an attack on the authority of officials of the centralized school system structure. It invested minority-group leaders and organizations who had previously been excluded from

channels of access and influence with new authority, undermined the authority of those whom school system officials had treated as spokesmen for these communities, and denied the established decision-makers the right to make a wide range of decisions affecting community residents. The basic tenets of this new view of decision-making can be summarized as follows:

1) the existence of non-negotiable rights (in this case, control over the education of one's children);

2) the resolution of issues involving non-negotiable rights <u>within</u> the communities affected;

3) denial of the legitimacy of authority of a centralized, distant power structure for dealing with issues involving non-negotiable rights; and

4) non-compliance with agreements made by outside authorities affecting non-negotiable rights of communities.

In contrast to these notions are the basic principles of traditional decision-making, practiced by those in positions of authority and well-established pressure groups who have access to these authorities:

1) an emphasis on rights established over time through negotiation with those in power;

2) resolution of controversies involving these rights through negotiation with those in power;

3) acceptance of the legitimacy of authority of those in power, and the system through which they function; and

4) compliance with the best agreement possible at a particular time and accumulation of debts and understandings in the process of negotiating this agreement that will be helpful in winning acquiescence to future demands.

In the Ocean Hill-Brownsville and I.S. 201 controversies, these two opposing views were operating. Central school system officials, city and state authorities, and United Federation of Teachers (UFT) leaders kept announcing "agreements" with which demonstration district leaders refused to comply. The officials outside the demonstration districts and the public in general, accustomed to the older view of decision-making, were aghast at "agreements" being ignored. From the point of view of the demonstration district leaders, however, these central school system officials and distant powers had no legitimate authority to make decisions about education for their communities.[1] These clashes presented a clear challenge to the legitimacy of authority of the central school system structure.

Such controversies are not unique to New York City. In several other major cities, demands for decentralization and community control are being directed at central school system authorities, and indicators of increasing disaffection from the public schools are becoming apparent.[2]

The indicators one can use to gauge level of support for public education present conflicting evidence. Many seem to suggest that such support is at rather low levels. This is particularly true when one examines persistent school-related controversies;[3] distrust of school system personnel;[4] attempts to oust particular incumbents in positions of authority in the school system;[5] demands to redistribute decision-making authority in the system;[6] voter defeats of school financial requests;[7] and increased interest in such alternative arrangements as decentralization,[8] community control,[9] storefront schools,[10] "free schools,"[11] private[12] and parochial schools,[13] performance contracting,[14] and tuition vouchers.[15]

When one analyzes public opinion data,[16] however, satisfaction with the schools continues to be widely expressed, along with statements of increased interest in nonpublic alternatives.[17] The extent of disaffection from the public schools, then, is not clear. Nor is it clear precisely what current levels of disaffection bode for the future.

No matter what the extent of disaffection from the public school system, it is already at a level sufficient to pose significant problems for the future of public education. If alternatives outside the public school system become widely available before an effective response is made inside the system, then public education will be in serious difficulty. The sources of this disaffection must be understood if the system is to be reformed so as to meet the perceived needs of its clients. The research we have undertaken should provide the kind of information needed to guide such efforts.

We have focused our attention on an alternative within the public schools that offers some promise of restoring legitimacy to the system, namely, opening schools to greater parental access and influence. Recent school controversies have focused largely on increasing citizen participation in educational decision-making. In our judgment, however, most parents and community leaders are concerned less with participation than with responsiveness to community needs. Increased responsiveness might result from increased community participation in decision-making, or from greater anticipation of community needs by those who now make school decisions. What seems important is the degree to which parents and others in the community feel that the system is open to parent and community influence; that system personnel are accessible for discussion of issues of concern

to those in the community; and that system functioning can be made to reflect community desires. The public policy question in need of answers is whether opening up schools to increased community access and influence can restore legitmacy to the school system. This is the question that prompted the School Attitudes Study.

The basic question we are asking in this research is the extent to which the openness of a school is related to the legitimacy parents accord it and the school system in general. Implied in this question is a causal relationship. The implied cause is a structural feature of an individual school, its openness or responsiveness to parent and community access and influence. The implied effect is a pattern of attitudes and feelings we are referring to as a sense of legitimacy. We are assuming that somehow this structural feature gets translated into system affect, defined as a general kind of attachment or loyalty to the individual school, which is generalized to some extent to the broader school system.

Legitimacy is being defined here in terms of attachment to the local public school and to the city school system as presently structured and functioning. Most crucial to the concept of legitimacy is the belief that the decision-making authority of a particular system is appropriate or proper, that its actions and decisions are right, and that there is a duty to obey these decisions even if one disagrees with a particular decision, opposes a particular individual in a position of authority in the system, or thinks the system is ineffective.

Openness is being analyzed in terms of two dimensions: extent to which school personnel are accessible to parents and community leaders, and extent to which these personnel are open to parent and community influence in significant areas of decision-making.

This relationship between legitimacy and openness must be examined in a number of different school-community contexts in order to delineate the underlying processes. We must try to determine why some parents take a posture of challenge and demand, while others remain compliant or even content. It is important to know whether the differences are due primarily to personal background factors, or to situational factors such as the ways school personnel relate to parents and community residents. Certainly we must ask why some schools are the targets of protest and attack, while community-school relations in others are relatively amicable. Further, it is important to determine whether situational factors that are relatively amenable to change are significant sources of disaffection, or whether the causes could be relieved only by massive social reform.

These questions must be examined in different school-community contexts, varying in ethnicity and socioeconomic level. There are significant differences between ethnic and socioeconomic groups in a wide variety of research findings. The groups most critical of the schools are at the two extremes of the socioeconomic spectrum, the affluent and the families on welfare.[18] Minority-group respondents, particularly blacks, tend to express more critical opinions of the schools than whites,[19] but minority-group voters tend to be far more supportive of the schools in financial elections than white voters.[20] Of those who have expressed interest in alternatives, minority-group parents tend to look for alternative arrangements <u>within</u> public school systems,[21] while whites seem more attracted to alternatives <u>outside</u> public education.[22] We must assume, then, that there are different forces generating legitimacy or disaffection in different subgroups of the population.

Factors other than openness may influence the legitimacy accorded a school. Other variables that may play critical roles in determining legitimacy are: the effectiveness of a school in educating its students, the extent to which parents feel some trust in school personnel, and the school-related protest climate of the surrounding neighborhood.

For individuals, a number of variables may come into play in affecting their perceptions of a school and their willingness to accord it legitimacy. These variables include the following: the individual's educational level, his socioeconomic status, his age, where he attended school, the amount of school success or failure experienced by his children, how much he knows about the local school, whom he blames for school failures, how much he participates in school-related activities, his degree of involvement in social action organizations, his trust in public officials, his sense of competence in dealing with school officials or other public officials, the degree to which he is accepting of authority, and his attitudes toward engaging in protest activity. We have included measures of all these variables.

After completion of our data collection and analysis, we should be able to determine the extent of disaffection from the public schools in school-community contexts differing by ethnicity, socioeconomic level, openness, effectiveness, trust, and protest climate. We should also be able to indicate what factors explain different levels of support or disaffection in these different settings.

SECTION II

PROCEDURES*

The study plan for this research entailed analyzing data from several sources: interviews with mothers of children who attend public elementary schools, interviews with school personnel and community leaders, and school system records.

For the main questions to be investigated, the focus of analysis was schools, rather than individuals. Therefore, sample selection proceeded in two stages: first, selection of a sample of schools from all New York City schools eligible for inclusion; then, selection of a sample of mothers whose children attend each of these schools.

To date, the following work on this research has been completed: formulation of the research design; selection of sample schools; selection of a sample of mothers whose children attend each school; development and pretesting of an interview schedule, and administration of the schedule to our sample of 960 mothers in 64 school neighborhoods; and preparation of the interview data for analysis. The initial stages of data analysis have begun.

We are now preparing for the next phase of data collection. For each of the schools in our sample, we will interview school personnel and community leaders as the basis of our ratings of school openness and protest climate. Members of the research staff will also copy an extensive amount of additional data on each sample school from school system records.

---

*In this section we have omitted technical definitions and descriptions of standard procedures. These definitions, procedures, and detailed statements of reasons for particular research-design decisions are included in a separate version of this section, which is available for in-house circulation to any interested Center staff member.

A. CONTROLS

On the basis of analyses of school controversies over the last few years and the relevant research literature, we assumed that subgroups of the population differing by race/ethnicity* and by socioeconomic status (SES) would differ significantly in feelings of legitimacy or disaffection, and in their reasons for these feelings. In order to be able to test these hypotheses, we controlled variability in school ethnicity and SES in our sample selection procedures. For the research design employed in this study, we selected a sample of schools stratified by ethnic and SES classifications as indicated in the diagram below:

	Black	Puerto Rican	White
SES 1			
SES 2			
SES 3			
SES 4			

Control has been applied in limiting the kinds of schools eligible for inclusion in the study, in limiting the kinds of parents who could be interviewed, and in specifying criteria for matching interviewers to respondents. First, type of school on the public-private-parochial dimension was controlled: only public schools were included in the eligible school population.

*Hereafter in this report we will use the term ethnic, instead of racial/ethnic, in discussing schools or individuals categorized as black, Puerto Rican, or white.

Second, grade level of the school was controlled: only regular elementary schools* were included. Third, only schools that were largely segregated by ethnicity (i.e., 70% or more black, 70% or more Puerto Rican, or 70% or more white) were eligible for our sample. Fourth, the 34 public elementary schools in the borough of Richmond were eliminated from the eligible population. This latter decision was based mainly on consideration of the fact that Richmond is at present far less urbanized than the other four boroughs of New York City. A parallel consideration is that, as a result of extensive real estate development following the opening of the Verrazano Bridge, Richmond's status is undergoing rapid change toward greater urbanization. Our primary interest was in isolating important determinants of legitimacy for urben school systems. It might be of interest at some later time to compare a more rural area with more urbanized areas, but Richmond, because of its changing status, did not seem an appropriate locale for investigating rural-urban differences.

Controls were built into the interviewing procedures used in the study. Our eligibility criteria for respondents required that they 1) be mothers or female mother-substitutes; 2) have at least one child attending a grade from 1 through 6 in the specified neighborhood public elementary school; and 3) be of the school's dominant ethnic group.

To reduce response bias due to factors in interviewer-respondent interaction, interviewers were matched to respondents on sex and, in

*We excluded special schools such as those for socially maladjusted or deaf children, those in hospital or institutional settings, and the like. The regular elementary schools had to contain at least grades 2 through 5, since we used school achievement data for these grades from 1966 to 1969 to calculate school effectiveness indices; see discussion in this report on School Effectiveness Indices.

most cases, ethnic background. Only female interviewers were employed. Only black interviewers were sent to interview black respondents; only white interviewers were sent to interview white respondents; and only Spanish-speaking interviewers were sent to interview Puerto Rican respondents. (Not all the Spanish-speaking interviewers were Puerto Rican. Difficulties were encountered in finding a sufficient number of female Puerto Rican interviewers to meet our staff needs. All the interviewers of Spanish-speaking respondents were, however, fluent in the language.) Spanish-language interviews were conducted with a Spanish version of the interview schedule, previously translated to ensure standard language usage. Spanish-speaking mothers could choose to be interviewed in Spanish or in English.

B. SAMPLE SELECTION

1. Framework for Sampling

Before the study sample could be selected, we had to do a great deal of background demographic work to determine the distribution of ethnic mixes and SES levels in the eligible population of schools. For clarity of exposition here, we will first present the overall results of our classifications, so that the reader will be aware of the total framework within which sampling decisions were to be made. Then in subsequent sections we will present a full discussion of the definitions used to classify the two major components, school ethnic composition and SES level of school neighborhood.

In 1968-69, the most recent year for which lists were available, there were 578 public elementary schools in operation in New York City, excluding Richmond. Figure I shows the results of our initial classification of all these schools.

FIGURE I

PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN NEW YORK CITY (EXCLUDING RICHMOND)
BY SCHOOL ETHNIC COMPOSITION AND SCHOOL NEIGHBORHOOD SES LEVEL

School Ethnic Composition

School Neighborhood	Segregated - 70% or more: Black	P.R.	White	Integrated (50 to 69% White)	Mixed (No Ethnic Group More Than 49%)	Total
SES 1	14	8	0	0	25	47
SES 2	67	25	91	46	169	398
SES 3	6	0	86	19	8	119
SES 4	0	0	13	0	1	14
TOTAL	87	33	190	65	203	578

Inspection of Figure I shows that there were 310 segregated schools by our definition, or 54% of the schools. Only a small portion (11%) were integrated by our definition. A considerable proportion (35%) of the schools had mixed ethnic compositions; the various mixes included black-white, black-Puerto Rican, white-Puerto Rican, and black-white-Puerto Rican.*

Against this framework we began to make our sampling decisions. The first determining factor was that the resources available would not permit us to sample adequately from all the cells shown in Figure I. An indication of the scope of the resources is that our final sample size was 64 schools. We decided to use only segregated schools for the initial stage of the study, and eliminated from the eligible population the 268 schools with student populations that were not 70% or more black, 70% or more Puerto Rican, or 70% or more white. Our reasoning was that the segregated schools promised the greatest potential payoff for isolation of variables and identification of under-

*This mixed category also includes 3 predominantly Chinese schools, of SES level 2.

lying relationships. This assumption was based on the principle of maximizing variance -- that is, looking at extremes. If an effect or relationship is not discernible in the extreme and clearcut cases, it is much less likely to be discoverable in cases that are weaker or less clearly separable representations of the phenomena under investigation.

The decision to study only segregated schools can be regarded as a temporal one; and other decisions on what factors to control can be similarly regarded. Our research design is such that we can later add to it other variables which we have here eliminated from consideration. Thus we can add the integrated and mixed schools, or high schools, or private schools. But such investigations can be undertaken much more economically after variables have been isolated and relationships defined in the initial portion of the study, since we should then know where it is best to concentrate our effort.

2. Background Demographic Data*

For a number of purposes we needed ethnic and SES data for the neighborhood surrounding each school. In order to compile this data, we had to determine which census tracts and health areas, in whole or in part, comprise each school neighborhood. This was an arduous task: New York City is broken down into 2,225 census tracts, which constitute 346 health areas.

*All the demographic data gathered for this study and all calculations made on this data are available for use by the Center's staff. A data bank, including a file of statistics on each of the elementary schools in New York City, is being created and will be kept up to date by the staff of the Community Division. Also available are borough maps indicating school locations and the boundaries of census tracts and health areas. Additional material has been turned over to the Center's library.

The Board of Education publishes borough maps indicating the location of each public school; however, these maps do not show school boundaries. For each of these borough maps the Center's Technical Unit superimposed the boundaries of all census tracts and health areas. The copying of the exact boundaries of 310 schools from Board of Education records would have been an enormous task; and that task would have to be followed by plotting the precise boundaries on maps before we could list census tracts to be used in classification of SES level of the school neighborhoods. We decided that it was not necessary to achieve such a degree of precision for the initial sample selection. Contributing to this decision was the consideration that in New York City many census tracts are quite small in geographic area, and usually there are not marked differences in SES level between adjacent census tracts.

For the initial SES level classification shown in Figure I we therefore worked from the borough maps described above and used visual approximations of school boundaries, guided by the location of major intersecting streets and any other relevant information. On a data card for each of the 310 eligible schools, we listed the census tracts and health areas that fell either wholly or substantially within each school neighborhood.

After selection of the sample, we obtained the precise boundaries of the sample schools, and checked all stages of the classification procedures; this resulted in the reclassification of the SES level of seven of the 64 schools.

a. Ethnic Classification

The Board of Education's annual ethnic census of the student population of each New York City school served as the basis for our ethnic

categorization of schools. From the school ethnic data compiled by the Bureau of Educational Program Research and Statistics, our staff members copied the student ethnic census for each of the 316 schools in our population. We used the most recent data available, which were for the 1968-69 school year. Data for the 1969-70 school year were not available until June 1970, months after our sample had to be selected. We are now copying the 1969-70 ethnic data for the 64 schools in our final sample. If any of these schools should require a change in classification or eligibility for the sample, we will make the necessary adjustments in our handling of the data. For the sample schools we have also copied school ethnic data for 1965-66, so that we can investigate effects of changes over time in school ethnic composition.

The 70% cutting point used in defining segregated schools was decided on after inspection of the varieties of ethnic composition present in the population of schools. It was not difficult to find schools that were as high as 90% or more black or white, but there were no schools that were 90% or more Puerto Rican and few that were 80% or more Puerto Rican. We felt that 70% was the lowest cutoff point we were willing to define as segregated. This cutoff point provided a sufficient number of Puerto Rican schools to satisfy the needs of the research design.

Of the 310 schools eligible by this definition, 21 were later discarded because they lacked the school achievement data we needed.*

*The necessary achievement data was unavailable if a school was too new to have test results going back to 1966, if the school had not administered the standardized tests, or if the school did not have a second or a fifth grade. Of the 21 schools discarded because of lack of achievement data, 12 were black, 6 were Puerto Rican, and 3 were white; 3 were SES 1 and 18 were SES 2.

This left a final population of 289 schools from which to draw our sample.

Although we used only school ethnic data in determining the ethnic classification of schools, we also gathered neighborhood ethnic data. From 1960 national census information on ethnicity, and 1965 and 1970 City Planning Commission ethnic estimates of the population by health areas, we recorded ethnic information for the census tracts and health areas within the 64 sample-school boundaries. We will also collect 1970 census tract data on ethnicity. Thus in our data analysis we will be able to examine effects of differing degrees of congruence between school and neighborhood ethnicity, as well as effects of changes over time in neighborhood ethnicity.

b. SES Classification

There are no socioeconomic data available for all schools in New York City; there is only the information that some qualify for Title I funds and others do not. Therefore, socioeconomic data on the neighborhood surrounding each school are the best available means of categorizing schools on this important variable, imperfect as the relationship may be.

Using the most recent data available, we recorded a number of socioeconomic indicators for each of the 289 school neighborhoods. The main indicator used was family income as reported by the 1960 census. For the 64 school neighborhoods in our sample, we will check these income figures against 1970 census information, which is now becoming available. If there should be any sample school neighborhoods with significant differences between the 1960 and 1970 information, appropriate adjustments will be made.

For the 289 schools, we also obtained 1967 data on four other SES

indicators: welfare case load rates, Aid to Dependent Children case load rates, juvenile delinquency rates, and illegitimate birth rates. The New York City Youth Services Agency has published decile rankings for each health area in the city on each of the four indicators: these ranks show how depressed each health area is compared with other health areas in the city.[1] We used these rankings, together with the family income data, in defining the SES levels of school neighborhoods.

In arriving at definitions of SES levels of school neighborhoods, our objective was to find cutting points between categories that would produce a sufficient number of schools at each SES level, within the already chosen ethnic classifications, to meet the needs of the research design. At the same time, we wanted the cutting points to yield neighborhoods characterized by the predominance of four distinct family types frequently discussed in research literature: 1) families living at or below the poverty level; 2) relatively low-income, working-class families above the poverty level; 3) middle-income families; and 4) high-income families.

We chose the exact cutting points between SES levels empirically -- that is, we tried several different boundaries for each category, and also tried a division into five SES categories by splitting into two groups the final SES level 2. However, no amount of reasonable shifting of boundaries could produce certain types of schools, and therefore certain ethnic-SES cells in our design are empty. In the population of segregated schools, there were no white-SES 1, Puerto Rican-SES 3, or black- or Puerto Rican-SES 4 schools.

The final definitions of the school-neighborhood SES categories were the following:

Level 1: The mean of the median family incomes of all census tracts in the school neighborhood is $5,120 or less in 1969 dollars ($4,000 or less in 1960 dollars).* All health areas in the neighborhood ranked as low as 6 - 10 (the most depressed half) on the four 1967 indicators; most rankings were between 8 and 10.

Level 2: The mean of the median family incomes of all census tracts in the school neighborhood fell between $5,121 and $9,000 in 1969 dollars (between $4,001 and $7,000 in 1960 dollars). Health area rankings on the four 1967 indicators covered the whole range of 1 - 10.

Level 3: The mean of the median family incomes of all census tracts in the school neighborhood fell between $9,001 and $12,600 in 1969 dollars (between $7,001 and $10,000 in 1960 dollars). All health areas in the neighborhood ranked 1 - 5 (the least depressed half) on the four 1967 indicators.

Level 4: The mean of the median family incomes of all census tracts in the school neighborhood was above $12,600 in 1969 dollars (above $10,000 in 1960 dollars). All health areas in the neighborhood ranked between 1 and 5 (the least depressed half) on the four 1967 indicators.

With these definitions we classified the SES level of the school neighborhood as a whole, not the SES level of individual respondents. It is quite likely that the SES level of particular individuals will differ from the SES level of the school neighborhood in which they live.

*We converted 1960 dollars to 1969 figures by use of the Bureau of Labor Statistics index referred to as the "Consumer Price Index for Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers." We considered one 1960 dollar equal to approximately 1.3 1969 dollars. For the statistics on which this conversion factor is based, see: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Monthly Labor Review, 93 (January 1970), p. 108.

We will investigate the degree of correspondence between neighborhood SES level and individual SES levels as determined from our interview procedures.

3. Sample Size

In formulating the study's research design, it was necessary to make decisions about sample size for the two stages of sample selection: selection of a sample of schools and selection of a sample of mothers whose children attend each school.

We decided on 15 mothers per school as the minimum sample size we could accept and still maintain confidence in the reliability of our findings.* Assuming we were to interview 15 mothers per school, a sample of 101 schools was possible within our original resources. A later cutback, after we had selected our sample of 101 schools, made it necessary to decrease the final school sample size to 64 schools.

Figure II shows the successive stages of school sample selection. Part A, at the top, shows the total 289 schools eligible for inclusion in the sample, distributed by ethnicity and initial SES level. Part B shows for each ethnic-SES subsample the number of schools we decided to include to make up the originally intended sample of 101 schools. Part C shows for each cell the number of schools chosen for inclusion in the

*Elementary schools in New York City range in enrollments from slightly under 300 to over 2000. The number of families represented by those enrollments depends on the average number of children per family in each neighborhood. The schools with the highest enrollments tend to be located in lower SES black and Puerto Rican neighborhoods, and these also tend to have the largest number of children per family. It might be estimated that the number of families represented in school enrollments could range from 200 to 800. On the basis of this estimate, a sample size of 15 per school would be a 1.9% to 7.5% sample.

final sample of 64 schools. Part D shows the ethnic-SES distribution of the 64 sample schools after adjustment of SES levels using exact school boundaries.

4. Random Sample Selection Procedures

Standard random procedures, employing a table of random numbers, were used in selecting our samples. We made separate sequential assignments of random numbers and separate drawings of sample schools for each ethnic-SES subsample. When it became necessary to cut the size of the sample from 101 schools to 64, the same randomizing procedure was applied to the 101 previously selected schools.

To select our sample of mothers to be interviewed, we used standard block quota sampling procedures. Exact school neighborhood boundaries for each of the 64 schools in our sample were copied from Board of Education records. These boundaries were then drawn onto large-scale block maps of each borough. For each of the 64 schools in the sample, every block within the school boundaries was numbered in consecutive order, with numbering proceeding according to a predesignated pattern. The standard randomizing procedure, using a table of random numbers, was then applied to the resulting list of blocks for each school neighborhood. In each neighborhood, the first three blocks selected by this procedure were designated as the starting points for interviews in that neighborhood, with a maximum quota of five interviews to be completed on each block and a total of 15 interviews per school neighborhood. For each starting block, several substitute blocks were also drawn on the basis of their random numbers. Interviewers screened potential respondents and conducted interviews with only those individuals who met all the

FIGURE II

SUCCESSIVE STAGES OF SCHOOL SAMPLE SELECTION
(STRATIFICATION BY SCHOOL ETHNICITY AND SCHOOL NEIGHBORHOOD SES LEVEL)

A. TOTAL ELIGIBLE SCHOOL POPULATION (POTENTIAL SAMPLE POOL)

	Bl	PR	Wh	Total
SES 1	11	8	0	19
SES 2	58	19	88	165
SES 3	6	0	86	92
SES 4	0	0	13	13
TOTAL	75	27	187	289

B. NUMBER OF SAMPLE SCHOOLS PER CELL CHOSEN FOR TOTAL SAMPLE OF 101 SCHOOLS

	Bl	PR	Wh	Total
SES 1	10	8	--	18
SES 2	16	16	16	48
SES 3	6	--	16	22
SES 4	--	--	13	13
TOTAL	32	24	45	101

C. NUMBER OF SAMPLE SCHOOLS PER CELL WITH TOTAL SAMPLE REDUCED TO 64 SCHOOLS

	Bl	PR	Wh	Total
SES 1	6	6	--	12
SES 2	10	10	10	30
SES 3	6	--	10	16
SES 4	--	--	6	6
TOTAL	22	16	26	64

D. SAMPLE AFTER ADJUSTMENT OF SES CLASSIFICATION WITH EXACT SCHOOL BOUNDARIES

	Bl	PR	Wh	Total
SES 1	5	8	--	13
SES 2	13	8	10	31
SES 3	4	--	10	14
SES 4	--	--	6	6
TOTAL	22	16	26	64

eligibility requirements for inclusion in the study. Substitute blocks were used only if the quota of five eligible respondents could not be filled on a starting block. Interviewers were given standard instructions about starting points and paths to follow in canvassing blocks.

The only bias clearly inherent in these block quota sampling procedures is the bias against families whose children attend a given school but who live outside the boundaries of that school neighborhood; these are primarily families of children attending a school in the Open Enrollment program. This bias was judged to be minimal and in most cases nonexistent. This is especially true because of the limitation that respondents be of the same ethnic group as the 70%-or-more dominant group in the school population; in most cases, Open Enrollment entails the attendance of minority-group children in predominantly white schools. Information about the proportion of the student enrollment of each school who live outside the boundaries of the school neighborhood will be gathered for each school in our sample, and we will attempt to investigate this factor in our data analysis.

Care has been taken to avoid another source of bias common in research of this kind. We wanted to make certain that working mothers were adequately represented in our sample without increasing our costs by requiring that a quota of respondents in each school neighborhood be working mothers. Interviewers were therefore instructed to do the screening of respondents and setting of appointments for later interviews on weekends, and on weekdays between 3 P.M. and 10 P.M. Statistical controls on the working-nonworking factor may be applied to relevant questions in the data analysis.

All the safeguards against bias built into these sampling procedures have been closely monitored in the conduct of the interviewing. This phase of the study has been done under contract with the National Opinion Research Center (NORC). From our interactions with their staff, we have great confidence in their training and supervision of the interviewers and in the extent to which they have meticulously abided by the sampling procedures we specified.

C. DEVELOPMENT OF THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE, INTERVIEWING, AND PREPARATION OF DATA FOR ANALYSIS

The development of an interview schedule from which the maximum amount of information could be gleaned with the minimum cost was our most pressing task throughout the first six months of work on this research.

In developing the interview schedule, we had certain content categories in mind that the items must cover. These have been indicated in Section I -- perceptions of school effectiveness, feelings of trust in school personnel, perceptions concerning the openness of schools, and so forth. To obtain the questions, we searched the literature for items relevant to these content areas that had been used by other researchers, and either adopted or modified them; we constructed items when no satisfactory standard questions were available.

A lengthy version of the interview schedule was pretested in both Spanish and English. Data from the 45 pretest interviews were punched, verified, and sorted. Frequency distributions of responses to all items were examined for the total pilot sample and for the subgroups of black, Puerto Rican, and white respondents. Questions showing little variance were dropped. Those that seemed unclear were revised. Less than one-third

of the questions originally gathered or written for the interview schedule were included in the final instrument. The ordering of questions was arranged to produce a smooth-flowing interview with a minimum of tension, with emotionally tense items in positions least likely to have an unfavorable impact on other items.

NORC conducted the interviewing for us in May and June 1970 and sent us completed, edited interview schedules. The 960 (64x15) schedules were checked, coded, and prepared for keypunching. The precoded format of most items on the interview schedule reduced both the cost of this task and the possibility of coding errors.

The Appendix to this report contains copies of the English and Spanish versions of the interview schedule for this study. The length of the interviews ranged from 30 minutes to two hours, averaging about 1 hour and 15 minutes.

D. SCHOOL RATINGS

Our interview schedule included questions to measure mothers' views of the effectiveness and openness of the neighborhood public school. For each of the 64 schools in our sample, then, we will have information on mothers' perceptions of the school's effectiveness and openness. In addition, our research team is developing indices of objective school effectiveness, school openness, and the school-related protest climate of the neighborhood surrounding each school. Most of the work on this phase of the research will be undertaken in the coming year. Some of it has already begun.

1. School Effectiveness Indices

Agreement on a criterion measure of school effectiveness posed significant problems for this research team. Obviously, a wide variety of factors influence different people in their judgments of school effectiveness, and most of these are not easily susceptible to measurement. Even for those factors susceptible to measurement, data are difficult to obtain. The main exception to this situation is the readily available scores on standardized achievement tests taken by virtually every child who attends the New York City public schools.

Within our research team, there was some disagreement over defining effectiveness solely in terms of outputs (that is, achievement or other outcomes of schooling). Alternative suggestions were to define effectiveness in terms of inputs, or some combination of inputs and outputs. Those who favored these alternative approaches wanted to try to give weight to potentially significant school variables not tapped by achievement scores (or by achievement no matter what the measure). They argued that test scores have limited usefulness for tapping the achievement of minority-group children, especially Spanish-speaking children.

Although we do not regard scores on standardized tests as a completely satisfactory measure of school effectiveness, we finally decided to use achievement data for this purpose. It is not simply that these data are readily available, for all grades beyond the first grade, for all schools, but that these scores enable us to talk about minimal achievement, i.e., the least that educators have traditionally

expected from a school to regard it as effective. Such minimal achievement may well be the issue in minority-group neighborhoods where some people question the legitimacy of the schools. The salience of this minimal achievement is an empirical question that we can analyze by comparing the perceived-effectiveness data in our interview responses with the effectiveness of a school as measured by standardized achievement test results.

Members of our staff have copied reading achievement scores from the records of the New York City Board of Education Bureau of Educational Research. For each of the 64 schools in our sample, we have mean grade equivalent scores for each grade from 2 through 5.* Scores were obtained for 1966, 1967, 1968, and 1969; 1970 scores will be copied this fall.

We have calculated several different indices from these test scores and will decide empirically which indices are most satisfactory as school effectiveness measures. The procedures used to calculate these indices will be described in a later report. At this point, the reader should simply bear in mind that the schools in our sample are random with respect to any measure of effectiveness.

?. Other School Data

In addition to reading achievement scores, we will also use other school data. Work has already begun on gathering the following data for each school in our sample: percentage of students reading at or above

*We used test scores for grades 2 through 5 because citywide achievement tests are not given in grade 1; and to have required data for grade 6 would have eliminated a large number of otherwise eligible schools where grade 6 has been moved to intermediate schools.

grade level; arithmetic achievement scores (mean grade equivalents); percentage ethnic changes in student population over the past four years; percentage of student population who are Open Enrollment students; student turnover rates (based on number of pupil admissions and discharges per school year); school classification as Regular, Special Service, or More Effective School; school classification as recipient or nonrecipient of Title I funds; number and type of special classes (e.g., I.G.C., CRMD); number and type of special programs; length of service of current principal and assistant principals of the school; percentage of teachers regularly licensed; percentage of teachers with five years or more of teaching experience; mean of teachers' salaries; size of enrollment; building utilization rate; mean class size; student-staff ratio; mean per-pupil expenditure; age of building; pupil attendance rate; teacher attendance rate; vandalism rates; and number of hours per week the school is open for after-school, evening, and weekend activities.

3. Ratings of School Openness and Protest Climate

In preparation for our interviews with school personnel and community leaders, we completed preliminary drafts of the interview schedules to be used, and gave some initial thought to procedures for determining whom to contact as community leaders in each school area.

The school personnel we wish to interview in each school are the following: the principal, an assistant principal in charge of discipline matters, a guidance counselor, the UFT chapter chairman, the paraprofessional assigned to the school's front door (if there is such an assignment), and the school secretary who handles pupil admissions and discharges. Our

aim in drawing up this list was to include people who have information about channels used by school staff in relating to the public, and about the amount of access and influence parents and community leaders have in relation to the school. Further, we wanted to speak with school personnel whose attitudes about parent access and influence are critical because of the extent to which they are in direct contact with parents who visit the school.

It was not possible to carry out this part of our study last spring. The acting Superintendent of Schools was unwilling to consent to our interviews with school personnel at that time; his reason was that the time of school personnel was already being overtaxed by the onslaught of evaluators who tend to conduct most of their work late in the spring. We hope to be more successful in getting the acquiescence of school officials to our requests this fall.

If we are unable to get this approval, we have considered a number of alternative means of gathering this information. We will proceed on the basis of these alternatives if it should become necessary. Even without this information, we can interview community leaders and we have data on parent-perceived openness. We will be able to answer most of the research questions from those data.

E. SUMMARY

The procedures we have used in this research entailed an extensive amount of control. We have eliminated variation in the kinds of schools eligible for our school sample: we included only public schools, on the elementary level, that met our definition of segregated schools.

We have excluded some variation in the kinds of parents eligible for our parents' sample: we included only mothers (or female mother-substitutes), who had children attending the specified neighborhood public school in our sample, and who were of the school's dominant ethnic group.

On ethnicity and SES, variation has not been eliminated, but rather it has been controlled. We have controlled variation in ethnicity by limiting eligibility of schools and of respondents to three categories of ethnicity: black, Puerto Rican, and white. We have controlled variation in school-neighborhood SES (but not in respondent SES) by basing our selection of ethnic-SES subsamples on our four-level SES classification scheme.

The effects of all other variables under investigation have been randomized by our procedures. For example, no controls have been employed in our handling of legitimacy, effectiveness, openness, or protest climate.

The population represented by our sample is obviously not all New York City public schools; therefore all the findings must be treated in a manner that clearly qualifies their generalizability. In Section III which follows, any reported impressions that we have gathered from initial inspection of our data must be understood to refer to data analyzed by school ethnicity-SES contexts. The subsamples for which we are reporting varying responses must be regarded in terms of these school contexts. The differences we will discuss between ethnic groups refer to black, Puerto Rican, and white mothers who have children attending 70%-or-more-segregated schools in which they are part of the dominant ethnic group.

Therefore, to view the differences we discuss as differences between blacks, Puerto Ricans, and whites per se would be to misunderstand the procedures we have used. It would be an even more serious error to interpret any reported differences between SES groups as differences between socioeconomic classes per se. The differences we will present between SES groups refer to differences between school neighborhoods of the specified SES levels. These qualifications should be kept clearly in mind in reading Section III.

SECTION III

FINDINGS

Analysis of the data already and still to be collected will require most of the coming year. Thus far we have inspected results only for single items or groups of items; no analyses have yet been made by schools. Here we will report on the item analyses for our total sample; responses have been partitioned into the eight ethnic-SES cells of the design.

We will first describe our obtained sample, since the way the individuals are distributed over the cells affects the interpretation of the results. Then we will report our impressions of trends and relationships in the data; and indicate questions suggested by particular findings, and how they will be pursued in subsequent analyses. No data tables are presented in this preliminary report; it seemed unwise to present such tables before performing tests of significance of differences.

We will present our tentative findings in terms of a priori groupings of the interview items. We selected the particular items in the interview schedule because we assumed they could be used to construct indices for the variables under investigation, such as perceived school effectiveness, school openness, school legitimacy, and so on. We will test our assumptions about clustering of items into groupings in later phases of the data analysis by correlational procedures and factor analysis.

Many of the items represent continuous variables, scaled from 1 to 5 or from 1 to 4; other items were to be answered simply yes or no. Our statements are based on examination of means and frequency distributions of the separate interview items for the sample as a whole and for ethnic-SES subsamples. Since we have not as yet performed any significance tests, it is possible that some of the differences we describe among subsamples may <u>not</u> be statistically significant.

A. DESCRIPTION OF OBTAINED SAMPLE.

In May and June 1970, 960 mothers were interviewed in 64 school neighborhoods, in accord with sample selection procedures described in Section II. The 960 interviews were distributed by ethnic-SES subsamples as indicated in Figure III.

Fourteen of the 960 interviews were discarded because the respondents did not meet one crucial eligibility requirement we specified: they were not of the school's dominant ethnic group. The screening procedures employed by our interviewers included interviewer judgments of respondents' ethnicity. In most cases of discarded interviews, the precise ethnic background of the respondents was not clear until late in the interview, as was the case, for instance, with blacks of Puerto Rican heritage. We discarded any case in which a question of eligibility arose; Spanish-speaking whites such as Cubans or Mexicans were not included in the white sample. The distribution of these discarded cases by subsample is indicated in Figure IV; the distribution of the 946 usable interviews by subsample is indicated in Figure V.

Since the present report is based on these 946 interviews, the contribution of the various cells to the grand or overall mean is weighted by the number of individuals in the cell. Thus the black-SES 3 cell, with an N of 58, contributes relatively much less to the grand mean than does the white-SES 2 cell with its N of 149. Figure VI indicates these weights in terms of percentages; it shows the number of individuals in each cell as a percentage of the total of 946.

The same principle concerning weighting applies to the row and column means. The row means allow us to compare individuals by SES levels; that is, they put together all individuals at a given SES level regardless of their ethnic grouping. The column means allow us to compare individuals by ethnic groupings; that is, they put together all individuals of a given ethnic group regardless of their SES level. The marginal totals in Figure VI show the respective weights. Thus since Puerto Ricans constitute only 25% of the total, their responses would have to deviate considerably from those of the other two ethnic groups before they could have a marked effect on the overall mean. Or since SES level 2 constitutes 49% of the total, that SES level has much more weight in determining the overall mean than do the other three SES levels.

Thus any references to the sample as a whole are based on examination of grand means and frequency distributions for all 946 respondents, and should be interpreted with Figure VI in mind. Impressions of differences by SES are based on examination of row means and frequency distributions of responses analyzed by SES level; they should be interpreted with Figure VII in mind. The percentages in each cell here indicate the breaadown of each SES level by ethnic group. Thus whites constitute 71% of all individuals from school neighborhoods of SES level 3. Reported differences by ethnicity are based on column means and frequency distributions of responses analyzed by ethnic grouping. Figure VIII shows the percentage breakdown of each ethnic group by SES level. Thus whenever we refer to blacks as a group, nearly 60% of them are from school neighborhoods of SES level 2.

In connection with this consideration of weighting, the empty cells in the design become important; they have a weight of zero in determining

FIGURE III

ADMINISTERED INTERVIEWS

SES	Black	P.R.	White	Total
1	75	120		195
2	195	120	150	465
3	60		150	210
4			90	90
Total	330	240	390	960

FIGURE IV

DISCARDED INTERVIEWS

SES	Black	P.R.	White	Total
1	-	-		-
2	-	1	1	2
3	2		6	8
4			4	4
Total	2	1	11	14

FIGURE V

USABLE INTERVIEWS

SES	Black	P.R.	White	Total
1	75	120		195
2	195	119	149	463
3	58		144	202
4			86	86
Total	328	239	379	946

FIGURE VI

SUBSAMPLE PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL SAMPLE

SES	Black	P.R.	White	Total
1	7.9%	12.7%		20.6%
2	20.6%	12.6%	15.8%	49.0%
3	6.1%		15.2%	21.3%
4			9.1%	9.1%
Total	34.6%	25.3%	40.1%	100.0%

FIGURE VII

BREAKDOWN OF SES SUBSAMPLES BY ETHNICITY

SES	Black	P.R.	White	Total
1	38.5%	61.5%		100.0%
2	42.1%	25.7%	32.2%	100.0%
3	28.7%		71.3%	100.0%
4			100.0%	100.0%

FIGURE VIII

BREAKDOWN OF ETHNIC SUBSAMPLES BY SES

SES	Black	P.R.	White
1	22.9%	50.2%	
2	59.4%	49.8%	39.3%
3	17.7%		38.0%
4			22.7%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

marginal and overall means. Note particularly that SES level 1 contains only blacks and Puerto Ricans; that SES level 3 is largely white; that SES level 4 consists only of whites; and that in referring to Puerto Ricans as a group there are no individuals from school neighborhoods of SES levels 3 or 4.

It would be possible to adjust the obtained means so as to equate for the differing N's in the various cells, but that has not yet been done. Future analyses based on different weightings may lead to revision of many of the impressions stated here.

One further set of qualifications concerns Puerto Rican respondents. In general they manifested a response pattern different from that of whites and blacks. On almost all items, regardless of content, and regardless of whether the phrasing of the question was positive or negative, Puerto Ricans gave relatively high proportions of undecided responses. The proportion of undecided responses given by Puerto Ricans on any one item tended to be significantly higher than their 25% proportion of the total sample. Puerto Rican mothers may truly be more uncertain; but another possibility, for which we have some evidence, is that they may be more reluctant to give unfavorable or negative responses. Whatever the reason, this response tendency affects the interpretation of results. Our impressions of the relationships among the ethnic groups may later need some modification.

Some questions referred to the particular neighborhood public elementary school attended by at least one of the mother's children. In discussing these questions we will refer to "P.S. X," but of course the interviewer inserted in the question the public school number for the

sample neighborhood where she was working. Some other questions were phrased in terms of a particular child. In these questions the interviewer inserted the name of the mother's oldest child attending a grade from 1 to 6 in the sample school. In discussing results of such questions, we will use the phrase, "the mother's child."

B. ITEM ANALYSIS

Satisfaction with the Local Community

After the initial screening to establish eligibility, the interview opened with a series of questions concerning the mother's satisfaction with five community services in her own community. For all groups considered together, the rank order of the mean ratings, from most to least dissatisfied, was as follows: children's play facilities available, police protection, transportation, and medical services and schools (the latter two were rated the same). The absolute amount of dissatisfaction expressed on any of the five items was not great; both the overall means and the various subsample means represent roughly a middle rating between satisfaction and dissatisfaction; none of them approached the point of extreme dissatisfaction.

Within this relative context, looking at the ethnic groups, the black mothers were the most dissatisfied with all these services, while the white mothers were generally least dissatisfied. Looking at the results by SES levels, the observed differences among SES levels were very slight, although as one might expect, the white-SES 4 group tended to express least dissatisfaction. Mothers at SES level 2 tended express slightly more dissatisfaction on this group of items than those at SES level 1. This latter finding reflects a trend that became apparent on

on some other questions; namely, it is not always those who are worst off who express the strongest negative opinions, but rather, at times, those who are one notch above the bottom level.

The observed findings on these five items are in agreement with those reported in the literature; in these general questions, schools were relatively more favorably rated than police protection and children's play facilities.

With respect to these results and all others to be reported here, the statements are descriptions of observed differences in magnitudes or proportions; that is, we are stating that one group was higher or lower than another. But whether these differences are or are not statistically significant remains to be tested.

An obvious initial question is whether there are warmup effects during the course of the interview; that is, do respondents feel freer to express negative opinions as the interview progresses? We do not intend to deal explicitly with the question of warmup in this report. At a later time we can examine the evidence available -- namely, internal relationships and sequential effects among items.

We cannot now say how long it would take to overcome warmup effects, if they are present. What we can say regarding the first five questions concerning community services is that they show no direct sequential effect, either of increasing or of decreasing dissatisfaction.

Mothers were asked whether they felt they were really a part of their community, or whether they regarded it as just a place to live. In most subgroups the responses were divided about half and half between these two alternatives. However, SES level 3 mothers, who were

either black or white, differed from the other subgroups in that only about one-fourth of them said they felt their community was merely a place to live.

Mothers' Ratings of Children's Achievement

When the mothers were asked how well their children were doing in school, the overwhelming majority of replies were at least average or better. The black mothers and the Puerto Rican SES 1 mothers reported somewhat less favorably on their children's educational accomplishment than did the other mothers. Possibly there was some ambiguity in our wording of the question; mothers could have applied many different interpretations to the word "average."

Perceived School Effectiveness

Another question, intended to elicit information on mothers' perceptions of school effectiveness, asked for a rating of the quality of the education the mother's children were receiving -- how good or how poor it is. Comparing the results for the two questions, all subgroups gave more favorable ratings of the quality of their children's education than of their satisfaction with the community's schools. However, the absolute differences between the corresponding means were not great. Looking at the results by SES levels, for both questions there was a straight linear trend, with the least favorable ratings at level 1 and the most favorable at level 4. There was a similar trend by ethnic groups, with blacks least favorable and whites most favorable.

Another pair of questions dealt with perceptions of P.S. X, although they did not refer specifically to effectiveness. First the mothers

were asked to rate P.S. X as to how good or poor they thought it was. Later they were asked to rate whether they considered P.S. X better or worse than most other public schools in their community. The results for these two questions were quite similar; on both, the ratings were quite favorable. They seldom said that their own child's school, P.S. X, was "poor" or "very poor"; and seldom said that it was worse than other public schools in the community. Across the subgroups there were the same linear trends previously reported, with black mothers least favorable and white most; also, SES 1 mothers were least favorable and SES 4 most favorable. These findings represent mothers' perceptions; it will be of interest to compare perceptions with some objective indicators of the quality of the particular school.

One group of questions asked for ratings of specific aspects of P.S. X -- the quality of its teachers, of its student discipline, of the teaching of reading, of the teacher of the mother's child, and of the kind of job being done by the principal. All subgroups gave highly favorable ratings to the school's teachers in general and to the particular teacher of the mother's child. The teaching of reading was rated slightly less favorably, except by the white and particularly the white SES 4 respondents. Next in order were the ratings of the principal of P.S. X; however, all the means were better than the midpoint of the scale. Among this set of questions, the poorest ratings were given to the quality of student discipline in P.S. X; also, the differences among the subgroups were sharpest on this item. The linear trends across SES levels and across the ethnic groups were at least slightly evident on all the questions in this group, but they were very clearcut on the question

of student discipline. Relative to the other items, the black and the SES 1 groups considered student discipline to be quite poor, while the white and SES 4 groups considered it to be quite good in their child's school.

Knowledge of the Local School

To secure some indicators of the mother's knowledge about P.S. X, we asked her what special programs there were in the school, the principal's name, and the name of the president of the Parent Association. The percentages who named a special program for children were lowest for the Puerto Rican mothers; the percentages for the white mothers were much higher than those for either the black or Puerto Rican groups. These percentages also tended to increase with SES level. Later we can compare these percentages with the factual situation in the various schools; for example, we can determine whether there were actually more special programs for children in operation in the white sample schools.

Very few respondents named any special program for adults in P.S. X, and the percentages who did so actually decreased at the higher SES levels. Again there is the question of the objective situation, but it seems likely that few special programs for adults are in operation in any of these schools.

Most of the white mothers (about nine-tenths) knew the name of the principal of their child's school. Over a third of the Puerto Rican mothers, and about one-fifth of the black mothers, did not know the principal's name. Both these latter groups tended much more often to check with a source before giving the name. There were relatively few errors at the two highest SES levels.

In the various subgroups, about one-half to four-fifths of the mothers could not give the name of the Parent Association president. The Puerto Rican mothers did most poorly on this item, while the white mothers did best; but not even half of any of the white subgroups gave the correct name.

Participation in School Affairs

We were interested in the extent of the mother's participation in the affairs of P.S. X. On the average, these mothers reported that they had gone inside P.S. X about three to five times this year to see the principal or a teacher. Only a small portion had not done so. The Puerto Rican mothers had visited the school for this purpose just a little less often than the black and white mothers. Visits increased slightly as SES level increased.

Visits to P.S. X to attend a group meeting, a class, or a program during the year were far less frequent. Nearly 40% of the mothers had either never gone to the school for this purpose or else had gone only once. Black and Puerto Rican mothers averaged about one or two such visits, and the white mothers three or four. Visits of this kind showed sharp increases with increases in SES level.

Overall, about three-fourths of the mothers had gone to the school this year during Open School Week or Open School Night. Percentages who attended were highest for the white mothers, but were also relatively high for black mothers, particularly those at SES level 1. Only about half the Puerto Rican mothers had attended the yearly Open School function in their child's school.

The mothers were asked whether they had talked with their child's teacher this year at any other time than the Open School function. More of them (about four-fifths) had done so than had attended an Open School function. The percentages who had talked with the teacher did not differ greatly among the ethnic groups nor the SES levels; however, here the Puerto Rican mothers were not the lowest group. It is interesting that the black-SES 1 mothers had the highest percentage of affirmative responses, while the white-SES 4 mothers had one of the lowest percentages. Interpretation of these results must take into account the fact that we do not know who was the initiator of this activity.

To get at the respondent's activism concerning school issues, we asked whether she had participated in any of a variety of school-related activities in the last three years. Many mothers said they had attended a meeting or rally about the schools. SES levels 3 and 4 had the highest such attendance. The percentages of attendance were lowest for the Puerto Rican mothers; nevertheless, more than a third of them had attended a school-related meeting or rally.

Somewhat fewer said they had signed a petition about the schools in the last three years, but still approximately at least a third of each subgroup had done so. The white mothers at SES levels 3 and 4 had signed such a petition much more often than mothers in the other subgroups.

The remaining three activities we asked about were collecting signatures on a petition about schools, being a member of a group that discussed a complaint or a problem with a principal, and taking part in a

group demonstration at a school. Only a small proportion of the mothers had engaged in any of these activities in the last three years; group discussion of a complaint with a principal occurred more often than the other two activities. Comparing the three ethnic groups, the Puerto Rican mothers showed the lowest percentages in all three of these activities.

Because the percentages drop so low, it is difficult to interpret the results for an interrelated and gradated series of items such as this by inspecting the items one at a time. It will probably be more useful to obtain, for each individual, a combined score for the group of items. After we inspect the intercorrelation matrix, we can decide how to weight the components of the combined score.

Mothers were asked if they belonged to any school parent associations or any other organizations concerned with education. Among the ethnic groups, the membership percentages were lowest for the Puerto Rican mothers; a little over a fourth of them belonged to such organizations. Membership was very high among the white mothers, well over two-thirds of them being members.

The percentages of the various subgroups who had ever been an officer or been on a committee of any of these education-related organizations was of course much lower. For most subgroups, about one-fifth to one-fourth had been officers or committee members, but two ethnic-SES subgroups were strikingly low in this activity -- namely, the Puerto Rican-SES 1 and the black-SES 1 mothers.

On the average, the mothers who were members of a school-related organization reported that they attended meetings of the organization

a little less often than once a month. Differences in frequency of attendance by these members were slight. Members who were white attended a little less often than those of the other two ethnic groups; also, frequency of attendance decreased slightly with increased SES level.

Very few of these mothers had ever kept their child home from school as a protest. This activity occurred least often in the Puerto Rican group and in the SES level 1 group. It occurred most often (but still relatively rarely) in the two most extremely disparate ethnic-SES subgroups -- the black-SES 1 and the white-SES 4.

The mothers were also asked if they would be willing to keep their child home from school as a protest; in the interview this question preceded the factual question above. Considerably more of the mothers expressed willingness to keep their child home than had ever actually done so. In nearly all respects the results were quite parallel to those for the factual item. The only slight shift was that here the black-SES 1 mothers expressed slightly more willingness to keep their child home than the white-SES 4 mothers. The findings for this item lead us to emphasize a general caution in interpreting these interview results: what people say they will do or might do is not necessarily the same as what they actually do or have done.

Sense of Confidence in Dealing with School Authorities

As an indicator of feelings of competence, mothers were asked the following question: "Suppose the principal of P.S.(X)took an action that you considered very harmful or unjust. How successful do you think you could be in getting him to change his mind -- very successful, somewhat successful, or not very successful?" The results showed only slight

differences among subgroups; most of the respondents were not very optimistic about the possibility of their getting the principal to change his mind. The black mothers and the SES level 3 mothers were slightly more sanguine than the others; the white-SES 4 mothers were least optimistic.

School Openness: Access

Four items assessed respondents' perceptions of ease of access to school personnel and their satisfaction with perceived accessibility. These items focused on the specified local public school in our sample. On all four items, little dissatisfaction with accessibility was expressed. The overall means and the various subsample means indicate high levels of satisfaction with parent access to principals and to teachers, whether the matter to be discussed involves an inquiry about a particular child or a complaint. Parents in predominantly white schools tended to be the most satisfied with access; parents in predominantly black schools tended to be the least satisfied.

In general, satisfaction with access increased with SES level, but perceptions of the factual situation concerning access did not show this simple linear relationship. Instead, the general pattern was that the greatest ease of access was perceived by the whites in neighborhoods of the highest of our four SES levels, followed next by blacks and Puerto Ricans living in neighborhoods at the opposite extreme of the SES scale. The SES 2 and SES 3 groups perceived the least access; on some of the items, the SES 2 group saw the least access; on other items the SES 3 group saw the least access.

The differences in these judgments may reflect actual differences in accessibility in these schools, as well as differences in attitudes about how accessible school personnel should be. If we are able to gather and analyze data on the actual openness of each of our sample schools, as discussed in Section II, we will attempt to determine how much variance on these items is attributable to actual school openness and how much to respondents' attitudes. Clearly, this issue is of great importance in applying our findings to the development of school-community programs.

The 10% to 20% of our sample who deviated from the general pattern of satisfaction with access to school personnel are of great interest to us. In future analyses, we will develop profiles differentiating mothers who tend to be dissatisfied from those who tend to be satisfied with the schools, on access as well as other dimensions.

When asked about the accessibility of school personnel to community leaders, respondents answered with a greater amount of uncertainty than when asked about accessibility for parents, and larger proportions thought access to be a problem for community leaders than for parents.

School Openness: Influences on Decision-Making

Parents and community residents may have little difficulty in gaining access to school officials for discussions but still have little influence on the content of school decisions. The interview schedule included many items that tapped mothers' perceptions of who now influences the decisions made by the principal of P.S. X, and who should influence such decisions.

Respondents were asked how much influence they believed a number of individuals and groups had on decisions made by the local school's principal; we asked about the influence of parents, teachers, the Parent Association president, local school board members, the UFT, and community leaders. Comparison of the overall means and the subsample means for all these items indicates that the UFT and teachers in general are perceived to have the greatest amount of influence on the local principal.

Next in order of perceived influence, in general, was the Parent Association president, followed by parents. Local school board members are perceived to have less influence than the parents, and community leaders are perceived to have the least influence of all. The differences among these items are not great; means on all items and for all subsamples tend to hover around the response "some influence" rather than "great deal" of influence or "no influence."

Relatively few mothers in any subsample responded that parents had no influence (overall only 1%). Surprisingly, whites had the largest proportion of any ethnic group responding that parents had no influence, while Puerto Ricans had the largest proportion of any ethnic group responding that parents had a great deal of influence.

Teacher influence was perceived to be strongest by Puerto Ricans and by the more affluent blacks at our SES level 3. Teacher influence was perceived as less strong by whites than by either blacks or Puerto Ricans. Among whites, there was a very modest trend of decreasing amount of perceived teacher influence with increasing SES level.

The UFT's influence was believed to be particularly strong by the more affluent blacks at the SES 3 level; 50% of this group responded that the UFT had a great deal of influence. Otherwise, there were no marked differences among subgroups on this item.

Differences among groups were not great in assessing the influence of local school board members on principals' decisions. However, blacks did rate this source of influence highest, while whites rated it lowest. There was also a moderate trend of decreasing influence perceived with rises in SES level.

Although, again, the differences were not great, community leaders were perceived to have more influence by blacks than by Puerto Ricans or whites; the black SES 3 subsample rated their influence to be particularly high.

When means for all these items about how much influence these groups or individuals now have were compared with means for items about how much influence they should have, several patterns emerged. On virtually every item, respondents of all subsamples said that these groups should have more influence. The one exception here was the UFT. The means for three of our subsamples (SES 3 whites, SES 4 whites, and especially SES 3 blacks) indicate that the more affluent respondents felt that the UFT should have less influence on the decisions of local principals than it has now. This is a particularly surprising finding for the two white subsamples, especially the SES 3 group, since people from such neighborhoods seemed to strongly back the UFT in its strikes and in school-related controversies in recent years.

Still, teachers in general (apart from the UFT) were given more support than any other group, even parents, in response to questions about how much influence various groups and individuals should have. Blacks of SES 1 and SES 2 were the only subsamples to give more support to parent influence than to teacher influence, but even here the differences between the means on the two items were slight. The Parent Association president tended to be given the next greatest amount of support, followed by the local school board members and then the UFT. Community leaders were given the least support for the sample as a whole (for blacks, the UFT ranked last and community leaders ranked next to last).

Community leaders, as a broad category, received much less support than we expected. There were relatively large proportions of undecided responses given to this item, particularly among Puerto Ricans and whites. It may well be that the phrase "community leaders" was too broad a term to present a clear stimulus; in many of these communities there may be no established leadership group. Or, perhaps parents are actually undecided about whether they would want "community leaders" to influence school decisions. Determining the precise meaning of this finding -- whether indeed parents are reluctant to increase the influence of community leaders in school matters -- seems to us to be a point that should be pursued in future research.

In general, satisfaction with the amount of parent and community influence on local school decisions increased with SES level and demonstrated the usual ethnic pattern on questions of school satisfaction, with whites most satisfied and blacks least satisfied. However, the differences between ethnic groups were slight. The means for all

subsamples tended to fall approximately midway between the positions that there is either too much or too little parent and community influence on school decisions.

Desire for increased parental influence and an enlarged parental role in school decision-making generally decreased with rising SES level. The usual ethnic pattern was manifest here too: blacks desired the most enlargement of the parental role in decision-making, followed by Puerto Ricans; whites were least desirous of an increased role. We did not expect working-class whites to be more concerned about increasing parental influence than more affluent whites, but our data indicates this pattern. The greater reluctance of upper-income whites to approve increased outside influence on principals' decision-making is apparent, whether the outside influence asked about is to come from parents, teachers, the UFT, Parent Association presidents, local school board members, or community leaders; it is also apparent regardless of the particular area of decision-making in which outside influence is to be exerted.

A series of seven items was used to determine which areas of decision-making parents most desired to influence and which areas they least desired to influence. For all groups considered together, the rank order of mean ratings, from most to least desired influence, was as follows: setting educational goals, allocating district funds, deciding what is to be taught, removing teachers, hiring and removing principals, choosing textbooks and other learning materials, and, least of all, hiring teachers. Particular subsamples deviated only slightly from this general pattern, usually by no more than one or two ranks for any

individual item. No items or subsamples had particularly extreme responses; the overall mean for the whole sample for all items taken together was almost exactly midway between agreement and disagreement with statements about the need for increased parental involvement in these areas of decision-making.

There were two areas of decision-making in which SES 4 whites were more willing than usual to express a desire for increased parental influence: removing teachers and allocating district funds. In one area, removing teachers, Puerto Ricans were less reluctant than whites to agree that parents should have more of a say; on all other issues Puerto Rican responses tended to fall somewhere between the amount of increased influence desired by blacks and by whites.

Our pretest indicated that there was little value in asking how much influence students actually have on decisions made by the local elementary school principal. Almost all our pretest respondents indicated that they felt students now have no influence at all. We did not include this item in our interview schedule, but did ask respondents how much influence they felt students <u>should</u> have.

Our respondents were far less enthusiastic about increasing the influence of students than of any other group -- parents, teachers, community leaders, and the like. However, there were interesting differences among subsamples on this item. In general, with rising SES level, there was decreased interest in increasing student influence (but here the white-SES 3 respondents were even less enthusiastic about student influence than the white-SES 4 respondents). The two subsamples furthest apart on this item were the black-SES 3 group, who were <u>most</u>

interested in increased student influence, and the white-SES 3 group, who were least interested in increased student influence. Considering the results by ethnic groups alone, Puerto Ricans were most positive toward increased student influence and whites were least positive. A relatively large proportion of Puerto Ricans (approximately 33% of these respondents) stated that students should have a "great deal"of influence on the decisions of the local elementary school principal.

Several other items were included in the interview schedule to tap additional dimensions of our concept of school openness. Respondents were asked: whether they thought the local elementary school principal would reconsider if a group of parents let him know they did not like a given decision; whether the principal and teachers in the local school tried to keep parents and community residents informed about what was happening in the school; whether the principal and teachers tended to foresee the children's problems so that parent complaints were unnecessary; and how well the Parent Association officers expressed the respondent's views.

On all these items, the overall means indicated general satisfaction with school openness. There were, however, marked differences among subsamples, and least agreement with the statement that school personnel foresee problems. On most of these items, blacks were the least satisfied with school openness. Puerto Ricans felt more certain than other groups that their principals would respond to parent complaints by reconsidering decisions, and that their principals and teachers tended to foresee problems so that complaints were unnecessary. Whites were more content than the other ethnic groups about the efforts of school personnel

to keep them informed, and about the extent to which Parent Association officers expressed the respondents' views. No overall pattern was evident in these items when inspected by SES subsamples.

We included one other item here so that we could try to relate attitudes toward parental involvement in school decision-making to positions taken in recent school controversies over community control. At the time our interviews were conducted, an issue widely discussed in the media was what would become of the three New York City demonstration districts (Ocean Hill-Brownsville, I.S. 201, and Two Bridges). They were to be ended as autonomous entities on July 1, 1970 by the state's New York City school decentralization law; however, the respective school district officials could decide to continue them as separate experimental units within the larger districts into which they were absorbed.

We asked our respondents whether they felt the districts should be continued or ended. Over 40% of the total sample, mostly blacks and Puerto Ricans, responded that the districts should be continued; about 30% of the total sample, mostly whites, felt that the districts should be ended; another 30% had no preference one way or the other. Differences by SES level were slight compared with the rather large differences between ethnic groups. Clearly, ethnic polarization on this item is far greater than on items about parent and community influence in principle. We can more precisely delineate the relationship between attitudes toward parent influence and positions on the emotionally laden demonstration-district issue after we examine correlations in later stages of data analysis.

Trust in School Personnel

We have assumed that trust in school personnel is a major determinant of parents' perceptions of their children's schools. Trust may be an independent factor highly correlated with feelings of legitimacy; it may itself be a critical dimension of legitimacy. Factor analysis of our data can help us to determine the precise structure of the relationship between what we are referring to as "trust" and as "legitimacy."

We used four items to assess trust of school personnel. Each respondent was asked whether she believed school authorities could be trusted to do what is right; whether she sometimes thought that local school personnel did not tell her the truth about her child; whether she thought principals really cared about the children; and whether she thought teachers were more interested in their pay than in the education of the children. We tried to achieve some balance between positive and negative statements in wording these items.

The overall and subsample means indicate a generally high level of trust in school authorities. Trust tended to increase with rising neighborhood SES levels; the more affluent the neighborhood, the more respondents trusted their school personnel and believed that these personnel care about their children. Blacks tended to be least trusting, and perceived teachers and principals as least caring; whites tended to be most trusting and perceived these personnel as most caring. On most items, Puerto Rican mean responses were somewhere between the mean degree of trust expressed by blacks and by whites; however, Puerto Rican respondents were the least trusting of the three ethnic groups in judging whether teachers are more interested in their paychecks than in their students.

When the mean ratings on the four items are considered together, the most positive feelings registered by our respondents were toward principals; teachers fared less well in all subsamples. The differences in responses may reflect real differences in levels of respondent trust of teachers and of principals. Or, the differences may simply be artifacts of the negative phrasing employed in the teacher item and the positive phrasing used in the item on principals. This can be pursued in future phases of our research.

Blame for School Failure

We have hypothesized that some individuals are more predisposed toward questioning legitimacy of systems than others, and that one of the orientations necessary to such questioning is a willingness to hold the system and its personnel responsible for failure to meet system goals.

To test this hypothesis, we included an item aimed at determining whom the respondent blamed for school failure. The question reads as follows: "In many schools in New York City, the average student is reading two or more years below grade level. Whose fault do you think this is? . . . Can you think of what or who might be the cause of this?"

Our predesignated coding scheme for this open-ended item included school responses (teachers, principals, "the school," or the Board of Education and its central-system staff) and nonschool responses (the students themselves, parents, or the home environment). We were interested in analyzing responses in terms of relatively personalized focuses of blame-placing. However, our coding also allowed for various kinds

of nonpersonalized responses -- that is, responses that attributed responsibility for failure to conditions rather than to people or to the institution. Among such conditions mentioned by our respondents were: overcrowded classrooms, language barriers, insufficient funds, lack of experience of personnel, and poor learning materials. Despite probing by interviewers, respondents who gave these nonpersonalized responses were unwilling to place blame for these conditions on any person or institution. The distinction is more than hairsplitting; if our hypotheses are supported by the data we will be able to say that the distinction entails somewhat different orientations toward institutional failure, and that these orientations have different implications for judgments of legitimacy.

Respondents were free to give multiple responses to this question, and many respondents did give more than one answer. In addition to the initial coding of the open-ended responses into our response categories, a second stage of coding classified respondents into several groupings: those who named only school factors as responsible for failure (e.g., teachers, principals, overcrowding); those who named only nonschool factors (e.g., parents, the students themselves, language barriers); and those who named both school and nonschool factors. We also classified respondents into those who named relatively personalized factors; those who named only nonpersonalized factors; and those who named both. To test whether these categories do indeed represent different orientations toward system legitimacy, we can later perform separate analyses of patterns of relationships for each of these categories of responses.

Differences among ethnic-SES subsamples are already apparent from examination of frequency distributions of these responses. The students themselves were blamed for their school failures by more than one-fourth of our respondents. A tendency to blame the students seemed to decrease with rising SES levels. Puerto Ricans seemed most prone to blame the students, and whites seemed least so.

The students' parents, families, or home environments were blamed for school failures by more than 40% of our sample. Puerto Ricans were least oriented toward placing blame here. The tendency was strongest among SES 4-whites.

More than 40% of the sample attributed responsibility for school failures to teachers. Whites were least likely to mention teachers as the cause of these failures.

Principals were rarely mentioned. In all, only 2% of our sample named principals in response to this question.

Blame was placed on "the school" by less than 20% of the sample as a whole, but there were differences among subsamples. Whites and SES 3-blacks were most likely to name the school here; more than 40% of SES 4-whites gave this response.

The Board of Education and its central-system staff were named by only 10% of the sample as a whole. The differences among subsamples were slight, but Puerto Ricans least frequently gave this response, whites most frequently gave this response, and overall the frequency of this response seemed to increase with rising neighborhood SES levels.

Only 13% of our total sample attributed blame for school failure to nonpersonalized factors. When classified into orientation toward

fixing blame on school factors alone, nonschool factors alone, or a mixture of both, our sample as a whole divided fairly evenly among the three alternatives.

School Legitimacy

We developed 13 items for our interview schedule to measure school legitimacy. They focused on several different levels of specificity: the local public school, the New York City public school system, public education, and education in general. The questions were intended to assess the respondent's attachment to the local school, the city school system, public education, and education in general; her preference for education over other valued attainments; her faith in the ability of schools to meet educational goals; and her belief that the schools are a worthwhile investment of public resources.

A number of items asked the respondent about alternatives to the local public school and the kind of school system she would prefer her child to attend. Only a little more than one-third of our total sample expressed a preference for some school other than the specified local public school. The greatest amount of interest in alternatives was expressed by the black-SES 3 group; almost 60% of that group stated that they would like an alternative to their child's school. The least interest in alternatives was expressed by whites, particularly SES 2- and SES 3-whites. The white SES 4 group, while interested in alternatives, expressed less concern with alternatives than blacks or Puerto Ricans.

In three items, respondents were asked their preferences for particular alternatives to the local public school. Some respondents

said they would take any or all of the three options; others preferred only one or two of these. Different patterns of multiple responses will be examined in future phases of our data analysis.

Only 15% of the total sample indicated a preference for some public school other than the local school their child was attending. Blacks were more eager than whites or Puerto Ricans for some other public school as an alternative. They often named as preferred a school in a white neighborhood. The higher the SES level, the greater the tendency for blacks to say they preferred some other public school. Whites were much less interested than blacks or Puerto Ricans in some other public school; SES 4-whites were more interested in an alternative public school than other whites, but the differences were slight.

All subsamples were more enthusiastic about private or parochial school options than about the prospect of choosing some other public school. One-third of the total sample indicated a preference for a parochial school over their child's public school, and slightly more than that (probably including many of the same respondents) indicated they preferred a private school. With increasing neighborhood SES level, there was less interest in parochial schools and more interest in private schools. Puerto Ricans more strongly preferred nonpublic school options than did blacks or whites, and agreed more strongly with the statement that an alternative is needed to public education. Puerto Ricans were the only ethnic group in our sample to be more enthusiastic about parochial schools than private schools, but this is probably based on the fact that more than 80% of our Puerto Rican sample was Roman Catholic.

In addition to hypothetical questions about preferences for alternatives to the local public school, respondents were asked about the extent

to which they had actually used available options by sending any of their children to nonpublic schools. Of the entire sample, 11% (mostly whites) had sent their children to private or parochial schools.

Attachment to the local public school was measured by asking the respondent how unhappy she would be if the school's boundaries were changed and her child could no longer attend this school. This attachment to the local public school appeared to be greatest for whites; in all three ethnic groups, attachment appeared to increase with rising neighborhood SES level.

Attachment to the New York City public school system was measured by two items. The respondent was asked how unhappy she would be if she moved away from New York City and her children could no longer attend the city's public schools; also, whether she agreed or disagreed with the statement that New York City has the best public schools of any large city in the country. On these items, Puerto Ricans clearly expressed more attachment to the city's public schools than blacks or whites. Although on most items whites tended to demonstrate strong feelings of school legitimacy, whites seemed to be less distressed than blacks or Puerto Ricans with the hypothetical prospect of moving from the city and being forced to take their children out of the city's public schools. When the means for these responses were inspected by SES levels, attachment to the city's public schools appeared to decrease with increases in SES.

To some extent, another legitimacy item demonstrates this same pattern of particularly high legitimacy accorded by Puerto Ricans and decreasing legitimacy with higher SES levels. Respondents were told

that the United States Office of Education had set as a national goal having all school children reading on grade level; they were asked whether they thought the New York City schools could accomplish this if Congress appropriated needed funds. All subsamples expressed high levels of confidence in the city school system's capacity to accomplish this goal; only 16% of our total sample thought the city schools could not attain this objective. Whites expressed less confidence in the system than blacks or Puerto Ricans, and confidence in the system tended to decrease with rising SES levels, although the relationship here was not precisely linear.

Of our total sample, 57% disagreed with the statement that the public is getting its money's worth in supporting public education with its tax dollars. Examination of response means indicates an increasingly negative view from the SES 1 group to the SES 4 group. SES 4-whites were as critical of the school system here as black respondents, who on this indicator were the ethnic group least satisfied with public education.

Based on these legitimacy items, it appeared that whites and upper SES groups are more attached to their <u>local</u> public school than blacks or Puerto Ricans or lower SES groups, but less attached to the broader city school system. Puerto Ricans expressed more attachment to the city school system than the other ethnic groups, but their relative eagerness for alternatives of any kind suggests that they are not particularly enthusiastic about their local public schools. Blacks, and especially SES 3-blacks, overall expressed least attachment to either the local school or the city school system. All these relationships

will undergo much further examination in the correlational procedures we will employ in the next phase of data analysis.

C. FUTURE STAGES OF THIS STUDY

In this discussion we have omitted some interview items not directly related to schools; these are mainly background demographic questions and items that tap political orientations. Whether these nonschool items are important for the problem under investigation will become clear only after analysis of the intercorrelations.

Since this initial presentation deals only with results for single items or groups of items, obvious questions have arisen about possible interrelations among items. It is these interrelations that are of prime interest in this study. Our next step is to examine the 140 x 140 correlation matrix, or about 20,000 correlations. Factor analysis will simplify this task. Regression analyses and analyses of variance will also be performed.

The study's conclusions will be drawn from the total picture that emerges. These conclusions will enable us to make statements about the extent to which feelings of school legitimacy or disaffection are determined by perceptions of such things as school openness, school effectiveness, and trust in school personnel. We should be able to delineate differences among ethnic-SES subsamples in patterns of determinants of school legitimacy or disaffection; and we should be able to assess the relative contributions of school factors and personal background factors in generating feelings of legitimacy. What we are working toward is a model of the processes by which school legitimacy is generated, maintained, and undermined. Such a model would furnish a sound base for the development of programs in school-community relations.

REFERENCES

SECTION I: STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

1. For instance, see news releases of Ocean Hill-Brownsville Governing Board, especially those dated September 8, 1968, September 12, 1968; September 24, 1968; September 30, 1969. Also see Letter from Ocean Hill-Brownsville Governing Board to State Commissioner James Allen, October 30, 1968, and statements of Rev. Herbert C. Oliver, Chairman of the I.S. 201 Governing Board, printed in The New York Times articles in July 1970.

2. Among the cities where demands for decentralization, community participation, and community control have been particularly strong are Washington, D.C., Detroit, Boston, Philadelpha, Chicago, Los Angeles, and San Francisco. See Wallace Roberts, "The Battle for Urban Schools," The Saturday Review, 51 (November 16, 1968); "School Decentralization in Washington: Grounds for Optimism," Community, 1 (December 1, 1968); Tim Parsons, "Community Control Across the Nation," Community, 1 (February 1969); "Urban School Decentralization in the Nation," Community, 1 (March-April 1969); Mark Geier, "Decentralization Legislation," Community, 2 (March 1970); Albert P. Cardarelli, Decentralization and Community Control: A National Survey of the Public School Systems in the United States, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, March 1970; and George R. LaNoue, The Politics of School Decentralization, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, September 1970.

3. For developments in New York City alone, there are voluminous sources that could be consulted for descriptions of these controversies. Some of the historical developments are traced in Miriam Wasserman, The School Fix, New York City, U.S.A. (New York: Outerbridge and Dienstfrey, 1970) and David Rogers, 110 Livingston Street: Politics and Bureaucracy in the New York City School System (New York: Random House, 1968). For discussions of the I.S. 201 controversy of 1966-67, see "A Summary of the Controversy at I.S. 201," I.R.C.D. Bulletin, 2 - 3 (Winter 1966-67); Robert A. Dentler, "The Controversy over I.S. 201: In Reply to Preston Wilcox," The Urban Review, 1 (July 1966); G.S. Goldberg, "I.S. 201: An educational Landmark," I.R.C.D. Bulletin, 2 - 3 (Winter 1966-67); Dorothy S. Jones, "The Issues at I.S. 201: A View from the Parents' Committee," Integrated Education, 4 (October - November 1966); Jeremy Larner, "I.S. 201: Disaster in the Schools," Dissent, 14 (January - February 1967); Thomas K. Minter, Intermediate School 201, Manhattan: Center of Controversy - A Case Study (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard

Graduate School of Education, 1967); The United Teacher, 8 (October 1966), Special Issue on I.S. 201; Miriam Wasserman, "The I.S. 201 Story: One Observer's Version," The Urban Review, 3 (June 1969); Preston Wilcox, "The Controversy over I.S. 201: One View and a Proposal," The Urban Review, 1 (July 1966); and Charles E. Wilson, "Year One at I.S. 201," Social Policy, (May - June 1970). For reports on the three demonstration districts, see Eugenia Kemble, New York's Experiments in School Decentralization: A Look at Three Projects (New York: United Federation of Teachers, 1968); New York City Commission on Human Rights, Report on Three Demonstration Projects in the City Schools (New York: New York City Commission on Human Rights, 1968); and John H. Niermeyer et al. Final Report of the Advisory Committee on Decentralization (New York: The Board of Education, 1968). For discussion of the Oceaan Hill-Brownsville controversies, see Philip L. Alsworth and Roger R. Woock, "Ocean Hill-Brownsville: Urban Conflict and the Schools," Urban Education, 4 (April 1969); Maurice R. Berube and Marilyn Gittell, Confrontation at Ocean Hill-Brownsville (New York: Praeger, 1969); Maurice R. Berube, "New York Unschooled," Commonweal, 89 (October 25, 1968); Thomas R. Brooks, "Tragedy at Ocean Hill," Dissent, 16 (January - February 1969); Alec Campbell, "Is New York Possible? Lindsay's Poor, Rich City," The New Republic, 159 (November 11, 1968); Jason Epstein, "The Brooklyn Dodgers," The New York Review of Books, 11 (October 10, 1968); Jason Epstein, "The Issue at Ocean Hill-Brownsville," The New York Review of Books, 11 (November 21, 1968); Jason Epstein, "The Politics of School Decentralization," The New York Review of Books, 10 (June 6, 1968); Jason Epstein, "The Real McCoy," The New York Review of Books, 12 (March 13, 1969); Mario Fantini and Marilyn Gittell, "The Ocean Hill-Brownsville Experiment," Phi Delta Kappan, 50 (April 1969); Joseph Featherstone, "Community Control of our Schools," The New Republic, 158 (January 13, 1968); Joseph Featherstone, "Community Control: Down But Not Out," The New Republic, 161 (August 9 and 16, 1969); Joseph Featherstone, "Community Control of Schools: Off to a Bad Start," The New Republic, 160 (March 29, 1969); Joseph Featherstone, "Ocean Hill is Alive, and Well . . . . " The New Republic, 160 (April 19, 1969); Sandra Feldman, The Burden of Blame-Placing (New York: United Federation of Teachers, 1968); Fred Ferreti, "Who's to Blame in the School Strike," New York, 1 (November 18, 1968); Marilyn Gittell, "The Ocean Hill-Brownsville Experiment," Phi Delta Kappan, 50 (April 1969); Maurice J. Goldbloom, A Critique of the New York Civil Liberties Union Report on the Ocean Hill-Brownsville School Controversy (New York: The Ad Hoc Committee to Defend the Right to Teach, 1968); Maurice J. Goldbloom, "The New York School Crisis," Commentary, 47 (January 1969); Nat Hentoff, "Ad Hoc Committee on Confusion," The Village Voice, September 26, 1968; Nat Hentoff "Filling in the Paper of Record," The Village Voice, October 17, 1968; Marvin Hoffman, "The Ocean Hill School Crisis: Conflict in a Counterfeit Community," The New Republic, 159 (November 9, 1968); "Interview with Albert Shanker,"

The Urban Review, 3 (November 1968); Charles S. Isaacs, "A J.H.S. 271 Teacher Tells It Like He Sees It," The New York Times Magazine, November 24, 1968; Richard Karp, "School Decentralization in New York City, A Case Study," Interplay, 2 (August - September 1968); Richard Karp, "The Siege of Ocean Hill," Interplay, 2 (January 1969); Naomi Levine and Richard Cohen, Ocean Hill-Brownsville: Schools in Crisis - A Case History (New York: Popular Library, 1969); Michael Lewin, "Scab Journal: Diary of a Strikebreaking Teacher," New York, 1 (November 25, 1968); Martin Mayer, "Frustration Is the Word at Ocean Hill," The New York Times Magazine, May 19, 1968; Martin Mayer, "The Full and Sometimes Very Surprising Story of Ocean Hill, the Teachers' Union and the Teachers' Strikes of 1968," The New York Times Magazine, February 2, 1969; Martin Mayer, The Teachers Strike (New York: Harper and Row, 1968); John Mudd, "The Rights of Parents," The New Republic, 160 (January 4, 1969); New York Civil Liberties Union, The Burden of Blame: A Report on the Ocean Hill-Brownsville School Controversy (New York: New York Civil Liberties Union, 1968); Albert Shanker, "The Real Meaning of the New York City Teachers' Strike," Phi Delta Kappan, 50 (April 1969); Sol Stern, "'Scab' Teachers," Ramparts, (November 1968); I.F. Stone, "The Mason-Dixon Line Moves to New York," I.F. Stone's Weekly, 16 (November 4, 1968); Agee Ward, "Ocean Hill: Education, Community, Power, and the Media," The Center Forum, 3 (November 13, 1968); Carol Wielk, "Educational Progress at Ocean Hill," Community, 1 (May 1969); and Carol Wielk, "The Ocean Hill-Brownsville School Project: A Profile Community Issues, 1 (February 1969). For exchanges of letters about this controversy see Maurice R. Berube and Sandra Feldman in Commonweal, 89 (December 3, 1968); Dwight McDonald and Michael Harrington in The New York Review of Books, 11 (December 5, 1968), 12 (September 2, 1969), and 13 (September 16, 1969). For a report on developments in the Two Bridges Demonstration District, see Adele Spier, "Two Bridges Model School District: A Profile," Community Issues, 1 (February 1969). For descriptions of developments in the area surrounding Joan of Arc Junior High School, see Blanche Gandolf, "Election of Governing Board, Joan of Arc Unit," The Parents' Voice, 1 (November 1967); and Rosalie Stutz, "Parents Demand Voice in Policy," The Parents' Voice, 1 (November 1967); and "West Side," Community, 1 (November 1, 1968).

4. For instance, see "A Summary of the Controversy at I.S. 201," I.R.C.D. Bulletin; Jones, "The Issues at I.S. 201," Kemble, A Look at Three Projects; Larner," I.S. 201," Minter, I.S. 201 Case Study; Karp, "School Decentralization Case Study," New York City Commission on Human Rights, Report on Three Demonstration Projects; Niemeyer, Final Report of the Advisory Committee on Decentralization; New York Civil Liberties Union, The Burden of Blame; Newsletter from Ocean Hill-Brownsville Governing Board to Ocean Hill-Brownsville Residents, distributed in March 1968; and "Why We Are Not Participating in the Local School Board Elections: An Open Letter from Evelina Antonetty, Executive Director, United Bronx Parents," reprinted in Community, 2 (April 1970).

5. For instance, see Thomas A. Johnson, "Principal Under Fire of Parents in Brooklyn Requests Transfer," New York Times, May 17, 1967; M. A. Farber, "Faculty Meeting Disrupts a School in Brooklyn," The New York Times, May 18, 1967; John Sibley, "Brooklyn Parents Call Off a Boycott at P.S. 284," The New York Times, May 19, 1967; Thomas A. Johnson, "Principal Asks For a Transfer: 2nd in a week in Brooklyn - Target of Local Groups," The New York Times, May 20, 1967; Peter Kihss, "School Leaders See Bias in Bids to Oust Principals," The New York Times, May 22, 1967; Morris Kaplan, "Parents Protest Bronx Principal," The New York Times, April 23, 1968; Morris Kaplan, "Board of I.S. 148 Yields in Protest: Asks Principal be Shifted After Parents' Sleep-in," The New York Times, April 24, 1968; Morris Kaplan, "Board of Education Refuses to Shift I.S. 148 Principal, Forcing Local Officials to Do So," The New York Times, April 25, 1968; Steven V. Roberts, "White Principal Who Became Symbol Would Quit Boys High," The New York Times, May 29, 1968; Bernard Mackler, "The Theatre of the Absurd: The New York City Public Schools," Urban Education, 4 (January 1970).

6. Several writers, but particularly Marilyn Gittell, have described the demands being made for a redistribution of power in decision-making and the rationales for these demands. For instance, see Marilyn Gittell, "Community Control of Education," in Urban Riots: Violence and Social Change, Robert H. Connery, ed. (New York: Vintage, 1968); Marilyn Gittell, "Community Control of Education," Political Science Quarterly, 83 (August 1968); Marily Gittell, "Urban School Reform in the 1970's," Education and Urban Society, 1 (November 1968); Mario Fantini, Marily Gittell, and Richard Magat, Community Control and the Urban School (New York: Praeger, 1970); Annette T. Rubinstein, ed., Schools Against Children: The Case for Community Control (New York: Monthly Review, 1970); Henry M. Levin, Ed., Community Control of Schools (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1970); Ralph L. Kramer, Participation of the Poor (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1969); Alan A. Altshuler, Community Control: The Black Demand for Participation in Large American Cities (New York: Pegasus, 1970); Nathan Glazer, "For White and Black, Community Control is the Issue," The New York Times Magazine, April 27, 1969; and Michael D. Usdan and Raphael O. Nystrand, "Toward Participative Decision-Making: The Impact of Community Action Programs," Teachers College Record, 68 (November 1966).

7. Jean M. Flanigan, "Is there a Taxpayers' Revolt?" Phi Delta Kappan, 49 (October 1967); "Most Suburban School Budgets Voted," The New York Times, May 8, 1969; "Suburbs Vote on School Budgets; Only Rockland Approves All," The New York Times, May 9, 1969; The Center for Urban Education Task Force on Urban Education, Public Support For and Extent of Confidence in Urban Public Schools (New York: Center for Urban Education, 1969); Pete Sheehan, "Why the Money Ran Out in Youngstown," Phi Delta Kappan, 51 (November 1969); Linda Greenhouse, "Suburban Schools Worry Over Funds But Plan New Programs," The New York Times, September 6, 1970; William K. Stevens, "Tax Revolt: 46,000 Shut Out of School," The New York Times, September 14, 1970.

8. George R. La Nove, The Politics of School Decentralization, paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, September 11, 1970; Albert P. Cardaralli, Decentralization and Community Control: A National Survey of the Public School Systems in the United States. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational & Research Association, March 1970; "Urban School Decentralization in the Nation," Community, 1 (March-April 1969); Mark Geier, "Decentralization Legislation," Community, 2 (March 1970); "School Decentralization in Washington: Grounds for Optimism," Community, 1 (December 1, 1968); Marilyn Gittell and T. E. Hollander, Six Urban School Districts (New York: Praeger, 1968); Wallace Roberts, "The Battle for Urban Schools," The Saturday Review, 51 (November 16, 1968).

9. Leonard Buder, "Separate Schools for Harlem Urged by 2 Civil Rights Chiefs," New York Times, November 22, 1967; Carmen McCoy, "The Independent Harlem School System," Community, 1 (March-April 1969); M.A. Farber, "Ford Fund Aids State-Backed Private School System in Boston," New York Times, September 4, 1968; Susan L. Jacoby, "The Making of a Community School," The Urban Review, 2 (February 1968); Paul Lauter, "The Short, Happy Life of the Adams-Morgan Community School Project," Harvard Educational Review, 38 (Spring 1968); Victor Solomon, An Independent Board of Education for Harlem," Urban Affairs Quarterly, 4 (September 1968); Tim Parsons, "Community Control Across the Nation," Community, 1 (February 1969); Marilyn Gittell, "The Community School in the Nation," Community Issues, 2 (February 1970); "National Conference of Community Schools," Community, 1 (March-April 1969).

10. Leonard Buder, "Report on Storefront Schools," The New York Times, August 6, 1967; Chris Tree, "Storefront Schools," The Urban Review, 2 (February 1968).

11. Bonnie Barrett Stretch, "The Rise of the 'Free School'," The Saturday Review, 53 (June 20, 1970).

12. Grace Hechinger and Fred M. Hechinger, The New York Times Guide to New York City Private Schools (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1968); and Fred M. Hechinger, "Private Schools Plan Fee and Pupil Rises," The New York Times, July 1, 1969.

13. Gene Currivan, "81% in a Poll Back Catholic Schools," The New York Times, June 28, 1970.

14. "Will Industry Run our Ghetto Schools?" Nation's Schools, 85 (January 1970); Stanley Elam, "The Age of Accountability Dawns in Texarkana," Phi Delta Kappan, 51 (June 1970); Jack Rosenthal, "U.S. Plans Test of the Teaching of Pupils by Private Contractors," The New York Times, July 15, 1970; Ronald Schwartz, "Performance Contracts Catch On," Nation's Schools, 86 (August 1970); "Pay-as-You-Go Schooling," Newsweek, 76 (August 10, 1970); "Profit and Loss in Education," The Saturday Review, 53 (August 15, 1970; "Satisfaction Guaranteed or Money Back," The Saturday Review, 53 August 15, 1970); "Teaching for Profit," Newsweek, 76 (August 17, 1970); "Free Enterprise for Schools," Time, 96 (August 24, 1970); "Performance Contracting: How It Works in Texarkana," School Management (August 1970); "The Customers Pass the Test - or Else," Business Week (September 12, 1970); Ronald Schwartz, "Performance Contracting: Industry's Reaction," Nation's Schools, 86 (September 1970).

15. Center for Policy Studies, Education Vouchers (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Center for Policy Studies, 1970); Milton Friedman, "A Free Market in Education," The Public Interest, (Spring 1966); Henry M. Levin, "The Failure of the Public Schools and the Free Market Remedy," The Urban Review; 2 (June 1968); Robert M. Krughoff, "Private Schools for the Public," Education and Urban Society, 2 (November 1969); "Free Enterprise for Schools," Time, 96 (August 24, 1970); Christopher Jencks, "Giving Parents Money to Pay for Schooling: Education Vouchers," The New Republic, 163 (July 4, 1970); "Education Voucher," Urban Crisis Monitor, 3 (August 28, 1970).

16. For instance, see George Gallup, How the Nation Views the Public Schools: A Study of the Public Schools of the United States (Princeton: Gallup International, 1969): Louis Harris and Associates, A Study of the Attitudes of Parents in New York City and in Selected Suburbs Toward Their School Systems (New York: The Center for Urban Education, 1969); Angus Campbell and Howard Schuman," Racial Attitudes in Fifteen American Cities," Supplemental Studies for the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968): Richard F. Carter, Voters and Their Schools (Stanford: Stanford University, 1960); Paul F. Kline, Raphael O. Nystrand, and Edwin M. Bridges, "Citizen Views of Big City Schools, Theory into Practice, 8 (October 1969); Community Attitudes in Bedford Stuyvesant: An Area Study (New York: The Center for Urban Education, 1967); Market Opinion Research, A Study of Community Attitudes Toward the Public School System (Detroit) (Detroit: Market Opinion Research, 1969); Market Opinion Research, A Study of Community Attitudes Toward the Public School System - Columbus, Ohio (Detroit: Market Opinion Research, 1969); Final Report of the Advisory Committee on Decentralization (New York: The Board of Education, 1968). Chapter IV: and Bert E. Swanson, Edith

Cortin, and Eleanor Main, "Parents in Search of Community Influence in the Public Schools," Education and Urban Society (August 1969).

17. For instance, see Fred Hechinger, "Private Schools Win Favor in a Poll," The New York Times, June 29, 1969.

18. Community Attitudes in Bedford Stuyvesant; and Harris, A Study of Attitudes of Parents in New York City and Selected Suburbs.

19. Community Attitudes in Bedford Stuyvesant; Harris, A Study of Attitudes of Parents in New York City and Selected Suburbs; and Final Report of the Advisory Committee on Decentralization, Chapter IV.

20. Louis H. Masotti, "Patterns of White and Nonwhite School Referenda Participation and Support; Cleveland, 1960-64," in Educating an Urban Population, Marilyn Gittell ed. (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1967); and Ralph V. Smith, Stanley E. Flory, Rashid L. Bushshur, and Gary W. Shannon, Community Support for the Public Schools in a Large Metropolitan Area - Final Report (ERIC ED 026 706), 1968.

21. Community Attitudes in Bedford-Stuyvesant; Harris, A Study of Attitudes of Parents in New York City and Selected Suburbs; Final Report of the Advisory Committee on Decentralization, Chapter IV; Swanson, Cortin, and Main, Parents in Search of Community Influence in the Public Schools."

22. Hechinger, "Private Schools Win Favor in a Poll:" Currivan, "81% in a Poll Back Catholic Schools," and Streich, "The Rise of the 'Free School'".

SECTION II: PROCEDURES

1. Youth Services Agency, Human Resources Administration, Directory of Needs: Selected Socioeconomic Characteristics of Youth in New York City by Borough and Health Area (New York: Youth Services Agency, 1969).